

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed April 27, 2007, Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The Advisory Action mailed 8/13/2007 maintained the rejections. Claims 1-21 have been amended. No new matter has been added. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-17, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLean (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0124115 A1) in view of Kucera (U.S. Patent 4,864,501). Claims 4, 10-11, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLean in view of Kucera, as applied to claims 1,9 and 17 above, and further in view of Ovil (U.S. Patent Publication, 2004/0030540 A1).

The Advisory Action states that “Kucera teaches a tag may be added prior to a perceived error, identifying the type of error, such as a "strange word" tag which is a flag, having no content but instead allowing a true or false to be set to indicate the type of error perceived” and that “In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the tags indicating an error and containing no data of Kucera with the markers indicating errors of McLean providing the benefit of allowing a parser application to determine the location and type of a perceived error within the text such that the error may be processed accordingly.” In order to further clarify the invention, the claims have been amended.

As amended, Claim 1 recites in part “a second component that is configured to perform actions, including: placing a first XML element that includes an opening tag and an ending tag

that is placed before the beginning of an XML element that contains a spelling error and placing a second XML element that includes an opening tag and an ending tag that is placed after the XML element that contains the spelling error; wherein the first XML element includes an identifier indicating that it represents the beginning of the spelling error and wherein the second XML element includes an identifier indicating that it represents the end of the spelling error; wherein the first XML element and the second XML element do not include child elements and do not include content; wherein placement of the first XML element and the second XML element within the XML file do not affect the well formedness of the XML file; and placing a third XML element that includes an opening tag and an ending tag that is placed before the beginning of one or more XML elements that contain a grammar error and placing a fourth XML element that includes an opening tag and an ending tag that is placed after the one or more XML elements that contain the grammar error; wherein the third XML element includes an identifier indicating that it represents the beginning of the grammar error and wherein the fourth XML element includes an identifier indicating that it represents the end of the grammar error; wherein the third XML element and the fourth XML element do not include child elements and do not include content; wherein placement of the third XML element and the fourth XML element within the XML file do not affect the well formedness of the XML file.” In contrast, the cited references do not teach indicating errors as recited within Claim 1.

Instead, McLean teaches at paragraph 180 that misspellings follow the XML form:
<misspelled><wordlocation=m>ilustrated</word></misspelled>. Kucera is related to systems for the grammatical analysis of encoded text. At column 3, lines 48-57, Kucera states “FIG. 2 is a listing of the grammatical and syntactic tags used in the described prototype embodiment to


compactly encode the information for each word. Each tag is represented in the drawing by a one to three character mnemonic and also by a one to two digit tag code. There are ninety-three such tags, although any given text word will generally have between one and six possible tags. Each tag indicates a possible syntactic use of the word, or an inflection.” The tags illustrated in Kucera are abbreviations that are placed in front of words. These tags are not XML elements. Combining the teachings of Kucera with McLean would not result in the teachings of amended Claim 1. As such, Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable. Dependent Claims 2-7 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

Claim 8, as amended, recites in part “placing a first XML element that includes an opening tag and an ending tag before the beginning of an XML element that contains an error that is selected from a grammar error and a spelling error; wherein the first XML element includes an identifier indicating that it represents the beginning of the error; wherein the first XML element does not include child elements and does not include content; placing a second XML element that includes an opening tag and an ending tag after the XML element that contains the error; wherein the second XML element includes an identifier indicating that it represents the end of the error; wherein the second XML element does not include child elements and does not include content; wherein placing the first XML element and the second XML element do not affect the well formedness of the XML file.” Claim 8 is proposed to be allowable for at least the reasons presented above. Dependent Claims 9-14 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.

Claim 15 recites in part “a processor; and a memory, the memory being allocated for a plurality of computer-executable instructions which are loaded into the memory for execution by the processor, the computer-executable instructions performing steps comprising: a markup language file output by a word processor that includes a first XML element that includes an opening tag and an ending tag that is placed before the beginning of an XML element that contains an error that is one of a grammar error and a spelling error; wherein the first XML element includes an identifier indicating that it represents the beginning of the error; wherein the first XML element does not include child elements and does not include content; a second XML element that includes an opening tag and an ending tag after the XML element that contains the error; wherein the second XML element includes an identifier indicating that it represents the end of the error; wherein the second XML element does not include child elements and does not include content.” Claim 15 is proposed to be allowable for at least the reasons presented above. Dependent Claims 16-21 are proposed to be allowable as they depend from a valid base claim.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.



MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Timothy P. Sullivan
Registration No. 47,981
Direct Dial: 206.342.6254